

military spokesman, General William Caldwell, stated this effort was a failure and had "not met our overall expectations for sustaining a reduction in the level of violence."

Each of these instances has something in common. Each failed to improve the long-term security situation and the violence and death toll, which continues to rise. Even the Commander of U.S. Central Command has testified that top military commanders in Iraq do not believe increasing the number of troops is the right approach. He stated, in fact, more American forces prevent the Iraqis from doing more, from taking more of their own responsibility.

We know the solution is not to send more troops to Iraq without a real plan to secure the peace. Fifty-five percent of Americans do not believe more troops can secure Baghdad, and 59 percent of Americans want redeployment of American forces, this includes two-thirds of the Latino population, who want our troops brought home. A study done by the Pew Hispanic Center found that 75 percent of Latinos now believe that the U.S. made the wrong choice in using military force in Iraq.

Americans, as you know, voted November 7 for a new direction in Iraq, and we must deliver that promise. Our Nation needs a policy to secure and stabilize Iraq, one that constructively engages in diplomacy and partners with our neighbors there. We need a plan that ensures that there are no permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq and a plan to decrease the U.S. presence there. We need a plan which investigates and punishes companies like Halliburton engaged in war profiteering and fraud, like the \$1.4 billion in unreasonable and unsupported charges by Halliburton which the Defense Contract Audit Agency identified.

We need a policy and a plan to put welfare of our service men and women first so that they come home, rejoin their families and receive the care that they deserve. This should also include services for all of our veterans, both men and women.

□ 1800

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIRE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STUPAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ESCALATION OF TROOPS IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker and Members, I come to the floor of the House this evening in advance of the President's speech that is scheduled for, I think, 9 p.m. this evening, where the President is going to announce his new

approach to dealing with the debacle that he has created in Iraq. He has coined it, "New Way Forward." He has referred to it as a surge, but we all know what this is. This is an escalation.

The President of the United States is probably going to announce that the surge has already started. There are reports in the news already that about 90 advanced troops from the 82nd Airborne will arrive in Baghdad today, I believe. And so this so-called surge that the President has begun is one that is taking place without the support of the American people, without the support of many of the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle.

Americans, and elected officials, in particular, are sick and tired of being misled, of not being told the truth, and trying to explain to our constituents what this war in Iraq is all about. Americans, basically, have come to the conclusion that this war has been mismanaged, that they have not been told the truth, that there were no weapons of destruction.

Oh, there were promises made. We were told by Mr. Rumsfeld that we would be welcomed with open arms; we would be seen as the liberators. The Iraqis see us as occupiers, and they want us out of their country.

We were told that we didn't have to worry about the cost of this war because there would be profits from the oil in Iraq that would not only help pay for the war but it would help to reconstruct the damage that has been done to Iraq by the occupation.

Oh, we were told not only would we have oil resources that would repay or pay for some of this damage, we were told that enough troops were going to be, Iraqi troops were going to be trained and that the numbers were growing and that they would soon be able to take over the security of Iraq.

None of that has happened. As a matter of fact, what we are finding is that our troops are being deserted in times of crisis and confrontation by Iraqi soldiers, that they are being undermined, oftentimes, by Iraqi soldiers, and that our troops don't know a Shiite from a Sunni from a Kurd. And they are very much so in harm's way because they really don't know what they are fighting, why they are fighting and why they are in Iraq.

But this President plans on sending about 24,000 U.S. troops to Iraq. Five brigades of U.S. troops, about 20,000 soldiers will be deployed to Baghdad to suppress sectarian violence. An additional 4,000 troops will be sent to the Anwar Province to pursue insurgents.

Responsibility for security, he says, in all of the country's provinces will be turned over to Iraqi forces by November 2007. Oh, haven't we heard those kinds of promises before.

How can we put any faith in the President of the United States, the Commander-in-Chief, who first refused to send adequate numbers into the war? They were being told by their

commanders and their generals that they needed more troops, but, no, Mr. Rumsfeld convinced, I suppose, this President that we didn't need it, and so we didn't send them. And now, at the 12th hour, we are talking about sending more troops.

It is too late. It is too late to have this escalation. We have lost. We have mismanaged. We have created an untenable situation, and there is a civil war going on in Iraq, and we can't manage it. We cannot undo the harm that we have created, and it does not make good sense to send our troops into harm's way.

Not only is our Commander-in-Chief sending more troops, the length of Army deployments will be increased from 12 months to 15 months. Marine deployment will be increased to 12 months from 7 months. In addition, the amount of time they spend at home to rest before returning to Iraq will be shortened.

Mr. President, mothers, fathers and families want their children and their relatives home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE PRESIDENT'S TROOP SURGE IS TANTAMOUNT TO AN ESCALATION OF THE IRAQ WAR AND WILL NOT MAKE AMERICA OR IRAQ SAFER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank you for your leadership and presence during this important debate and discussion.

I almost don't know where to start. Because when you begin to discuss the issue of Iraq, you must be very cautious.

One, the constitutional premise is that the President is the Commander-in-Chief. The immediate inquiries of the press of how are you going to translate the vote of the American people into action, you are just the Congress; the Commander-in-Chief has every right to command the troops. And might I say that this President has commanded the troops. As I visited Afghanistan and Iraq, every one of those soldiers has stood up and said, I was willing to come and follow the orders of my Commander-in-Chief. I respect them, thank them, thank their families.

That is why I feel a special obligation to begin to renew the energy and the outrage that many of us expressed during the debate of 2002 when we had hoped that we would have secured